



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/748,432	12/30/2003	Charles R. Roe	10347/20018	7856
34725	7590	06/13/2006		EXAMINER
CHALKER FLORES, LLP 2711 LBJ FRWY Suite 1036 DALLAS, TX 75234				WEDDINGTON, KEVIN E
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				1614

DATE MAILED: 06/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/748,432	ROE, CHARLES R.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Kevin E. Weddington	1614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 March 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 15-18 and 21-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 15018 and 21-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

Claims 15-18 and 21-36 are presented for examination.

Applicants' request for continued examination and amendment filed March 6, 2006 have been received and entered.

Accordingly, the rejection made under 35 USC 112, first paragraph as set forth in the previous Office action dated January 24, 2006 at page 2 is hereby withdrawn since the applicants' amend the claims to recite the enable invention, "a method of suppressing the effects of translocase deficiency of a prematurely-born human infant by administering to prematurely-born human infant suspected of having a translocase deficiency a composition comprising a seven carbon fatty acid selected from triheptanoin or n-heptanoic acid or derivatives thereof."

The allowance of claims 30-36 is withdrawn so that a new rejection can be made.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention

made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 15-18 and 21-36 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 25-27, 38-40, 42-45 and 47-56 of copending Application No. 10/371,385. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the copending application teaches an infant formula comprising seven carbon fatty acids such as n-heptanoic acid and a triglyceride comprising n-heptanoic acid (triheptanoin) and combination thereof (A product); and the present application teaches methods of use claims containing the instant composition of the copending application therein which makes the method claims of the present application an obvious variation of the claims of the copending application.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claims 15-18 and 21-36 are not allowed.

Claims 15-18 and 21-36 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 53-57 of copending Application No. 10/748,495. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the copending application teaches a method for treating a patient in need of treatment for a severe translocase deficiency by administering a therapeutically effective amount of a seven-carbon chain fatty acid composition comprising n-heptanoic acid, triheptanoin, etc.;

Art Unit: 1614

and the present application teach methods of suppressing the effects of translocase deficiency of a prematurely-born human infant or a human infant with the administering of a composition comprising a seven carbon fatty acid selected from triheptanoin or n-heptanoic acid or derivatives thereof. Note that a patient encompasses a prematurely-born human infant and a human infant (born after 9 months). Clearly, the method of the copending application encompasses the methods of the present application.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claims 15-18 and 21-36 are not allowed.

The reference listed on the enclosed PTO-892 is cited to show the state of the art.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin E. Weddington whose telephone number is (571)272-0587. The examiner can normally be reached on 12:00 am-8:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ardin Marschel can be reached on (571)272-0718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1614

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Kevin E. Weddington
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1614

K. Weddington
June 8, 2006